DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 366 HE 012 103

AUTHOR Howell, Lloyd P.; And Others
TITLE Characteristics of Student Persisters and Non-Persisters at Old Dominion University.
INSTITUTION Old Dominion Univ., Norfolk, Va.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 78p.
AVAILABLE FROM Old Dominion University, Office of Institutional Studies, Norfolk, VA 23508

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; College Housing; Demography; *Dropout Characteristics; Dropout Research; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Research; Military Personnel; *Persistence; Predictor Variables; *School Holding Power; *Student Characteristics; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Old Dominion University; *Student Attrition

ABSTRACT

Demographic, academic, and other college-related characteristics of the persisting and nonpersisting students at Old Dominion University were investigated during a one-year period from fall 1976 to fall 1977. Information was collected from the student master registration file for a study population of 11,637 undergraduates. The students ranged in age from 18 to 67, came from various ethnic groups, and included both full- and part-time enrollments. A total of 65 percent of the student body persisted from one year to the next. This yielded a nonpersistence rate of 35 percent, slightly higher than the national average. It is noted, however, that the nonpersisting rate for degree-seeking students is only 22.4 percent. Academic factors were found to be the most important predictors of attrition. Student housing was also an important variable. Larger portions of the degree-seeking persisters than the degree-seeking nonpersisters were placed in campus housing, while larger proportions of the nonpersisting students indicated they wished to be placed on campus but were not. It is also noted that because of the unique environment in which the university operates, the nondegree student population consists of a large portion of active duty military personnel. This accounts for the fact that findings characterize the nondegree-seeking nonpersister as a male student who is on active military duty. It is suggested that research be conducted to determine students' reasons for attending or leaving Old Dominion University. Tables of statistical data are appended. (Author/SF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180366

Old Dominion University

Norfolk, Virginia

Characteristics of Student Persisters and Non-Persisters at Old Dominion University

Prepared by:

Lloyd R. Howell
Mark L. Perkins
Suzanne Young

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lloyd K. Howell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 103

Office of Institutional Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION PAGE

Preface

I. Executive Summary 2

II. Introduction. 5

III. Related Literature. 7

Problems in Researching Attrition
National Rates of Attrition
Demographic Factors Associated with Attrition
Academic Factors Associated with Attrition
Motivational, Vocational, and Personality Factors Associated with Attrition
College Environment
Reasons for Withdrawal
Summary

IV. Methodology 21

Definitions
Sample
Analysis

V. Results 24

Old Dominion University Degree Seeking Persisting and Non-Persisting Students
Old Dominion University Non-Degree Seeking Persisting and Non-Persisting Students

Appendix A. 30

References. 51

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Ages of ODU Students	31
2	Sex Distribution of ODU Students	32
3	Racial Distribution of ODU Students.	33
4	Marital Status of ODU Students	34
5	Legal Residency of ODU Students.	35
6	Military Status of ODU Students.	36
7	S.A.T. Verbal Scores of ODU Students	37
8	S.A.T. Math Scores of ODU Students	38
9	S.A.T. Combined Scores of ODU Students	39
10	High School Class Size of ODU Students	40
11	High School Percentile Rank of Students Enrolled at ODU.	41
12	High School QPA of Students Enrolled at ODU.	42
13	Level of Degree Sought by ODU Students	43
14	Quality Point Averages of ODU Students	44
15	School in Which Students Major	45
16	Number and Percent of ODU Students Desiring Financial Aid.	46
17	Application Status of ODU Students	47
18	Housing Preference of ODU Students	48
19	Day and Evening Class Attendance of ODU Students	49
20	Part-time Full-time Status of ODU Students	50

PREFACE

This project was a cooperative effort undertaken by the Office of Institutional Studies and Ms. Suzanne Young, a graduate student working on a Certificate of Advanced Study in the School of Education. Ms. Young played a major role in the design of the study and computer analysis of the data. We are also grateful to Dr. George Pratt who helped initiate the project and served as an advisor throughout the study. Dr. James Vaillancourt, Dean of Admissions, Records, and Registration, and Dr. John W. Moore, Vice President for Educational Services and Planning, made major contributions in conceptualizing and providing for the execution of this study. Without the assistance of these individuals and members of the Office of Institutional Studies staff, this report would not have been possible.

The authors accept full responsibility for the content of the report. Questions related to this study should be directed to the Office of Institutional Studies, Old Dominion University.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The findings in this study parallel those reported in the literature over the last 40 years. While there is no single variable which accurately predicts either student persistence or non-persistence, there are a number of variables which can be used to characterize these student types. Although this was a cross-sectional one-year study of the type which has been severely criticized by the pure researcher, the findings for Old Dominion University are nonetheless informative.

At Old Dominion University 65% of the total student body persisted from one year to the next yielding a non-persistence rate of 35% which is a little higher than the national average of 23.54% reported in the National Longitudinal Study (1973). It is interesting to note that the non-persisting rate for degree seeking students is only 22.4% which is a little less than the national average. On the other hand, the non-degree non-persistence rate is 70% or some 40% higher than the national average.

With the exception of the non-degree student, Old Dominion University's attrition or non-persistent rate is better than the national average. Because of the unique environment in which the University operates, the non-degree student population consists of a large proportion of active duty military personnel which of course is subject to transfer. The findings of this study clearly characterize the non-degree seeking non-persister as a male student who is on active military status.

The finding that academic factors are by far the most important predictors of attrition and account for half of the variance in college persistence and withdrawal was also given support by this study. With regard to degree seeking students, both pre-college and college academic variables are the most useful in distinguishing between student persisters and non-persisters. In general, student persisters in larger proportions perform better on both pre-college and college academic measures than do non-persisters.

Perhaps the most important finding in this study was that student housing was an important variable in the persistence/non-persistence pattern. Larger proportions of the degree seeking persisters than the degree seeking non-persisters were placed in campus housing, while larger proportions of the non-persisting students indicated they wished to be placed on campus but were not. This is the most meaningful finding in this study because it is the one variable which can be most directly affected by University policy or action out of the twenty which were investigated. Unlike academic performance which is the result of a variety of variables and military status which cannot be affected by the University, the amount of student housing and housing regulations can be more readily manipulated and controlled.

While the methodology of this study might be somewhat questionable to the most puritanical at heart, this study did provide results which will help us better understand the nature of the ODU student. With the exception of the findings related to our non-degree students both the attrition rate and characteristics of the traditional student are consistent with the findings of studies which have been conducted

over the past four decades. In considering the non-traditional or non-degree seeking student, the findings are consistent with what we would expect when we consider the nature of our non-degree student population. The non-degree non-persisting student represents approximately 19% of the total student population in the study and is best characterized as being male and on active duty military status. It will be extremely difficult to make significant inroads into stabilizing the non-persistence rate among non-degree students without making substantial progess in attracting non-military personnel into this category.

In light of the findings in this study, it is the opinion of the authors that further detailed analysis and costly longitudinal studies would not produce significantly different results or better information. Future efforts should focus on compiling information regarding students' reasons for attending or leaving Old Dominion University.

INTRODUCTION

Student attrition and retention has been one of the most researched topics in higher education over the past forty years. The abundance of research has not clearly identified those variables which are related to student attrition and persistence. In general, the findings suggest that student attrition and persistence is a complex problem resulting from the interplay of a large number of interdependent variables which may be specific to a particular institution or student population. With a decline in student enrollment being projected for the 1980's it is certain that student attrition and persistence will continue to be one of the most important issues in higher education as institutions strive to maintain their enrollments and position in the educational market place.

In order to deal with student persistence and non-persistence, we must understand its nature at our own institution. This study is an essential step in the process of obtaining a better understanding of the persisting and non-persisting student at Old Dominion University. The specific purpose of the study is to identify the characteristics of the degree and non-degree, persisting and non-persisting student at ODU using information available from the student Registration File.

The study uses a snapshot approach focusing on student persistence for a one-year period from Fall 1976 to Fall 1977. Readers should be cautious in interpreting the results of this study in light of the fact that many of those who are classified as "non-persisters" may really be "stop outs" who later return to ODU or

some other institution to continue their education. Results of this study should be most beneficial as we attempt to develop our understanding of student persistence and non-persistence at Old Dominion University.

Related Literature

The research on student persistence and attrition represents many divergent views on the influence or impact that a single variable or group of related variables have on student persistence or attrition. The research on retention and attrition over the last 40 years has been extensive, and for the purpose of this review is summarized in the following categories: rates of attrition problems in researching attrition, national attrition, demographic factors associated with attrition, academic factors associated with attrition, college environment and reasons for withdrawal. It is the intent of this review to highlight the findings in each of the seven areas. Complete references to the original works have been provided for those who wish more detail.

Problems in Researching Attrition

There are many problems associated with conducting persistence studies, most of which are either methodological, definitional, or theoretical. Research and concerns related to the appropriate approaches to persistence or attrition research are summarized for each of these three problem areas.

Methodological Problems

Many of the criticisms about research on withdrawal from college are centered around the methods used to study the problem. Basically, the criticism is focused on three concerns: (1) lack of control groups, (2) the use of only academic variables, and (3) use of ex post facto data.

Gekowski and Schwartz (1961) reported that many of the research studies reviewed by them focused primarily on the academic achievement of students on the assumption that college achievement was positively related to persistence. They also noted that much of the research was retrospective and failed to use comparison or control groups. Most of the studies they said focused on only one or two factors at a time when trying to discover the causes of attrition.

Marks (1967) said that studies he reviewed relied too heavily on ex post facto methodology. An investigation using this approach usually selects a sample of students that has already dropped out and attempts to discover from the students' pre-college records what factors may have been significant in causing and/or predicting withdrawal (e.g., socioeconomic data, high school achievements, etc.), or the investigations may simply use postwithdrawal interviews or questionnaires.

Jex and Merrill (1962) urged that the ex post facto approach be abandoned in favor of longitudinal studies. According to Jex and Merrill, one advantage of the longitudinal method is that it permits an explanation of factors that affect dropping out at the very time the factors are exerting their effects. Another advantage of this method is that it enables the researcher to distinguish more accurately between students who drop out and return to a particular college, students who drop out and transfer to another college, or students who drop out from higher education altogether.

Definitional Problems

Summerskill (1962) asserted that the definition of "attrition rate" had variously been defined as the percentage of students lost to a particular division within a college, lost to the college as a whole, or lost to higher education as a whole. Further, he said the criterion by which a student is to be classified as a dropout or non-dropout has also been variously defined. The question then is "Are nondropouts those students who graduate in four years, those who have graduated or are still enrolled after four years, or those who eventually graduate from colleges?" This definition of terms affects a study's usefullness to other researchers and educators.

Most of the early studies were cross-sectional and, therefore, defined "dropout" as any student who was previously enrolled at the college, but not enrolled at the time of study. Angers (1961), Bertrand (1955), and Carew (1957) stated that the results of these studies are questionable because they do not make accurate distinctions between permanent and temporary dropouts.

Panos and Astin (19[illegible]) concluded, "the results of many attrition studies are not comparable because they in fact deal with different phenomena." There are considerable differences of opinion among researchers as to how the dropout or nonpersister should be defined, but there is agreement that the concept needs much sharper definition than currently exists.

Theoretical Models

Tinto (1975), in a review of the literature on attrition, attributed our lack of knowledge about the nature of the dropout process to two main factors: failure to resolve questions of definition of the target population, and failure to move beyond

description to theoretical models that attempt to explain the processes that lead to withdrawal.

Tinto stressed the need for a conceptual framework if we are to understand the processes that lead to attrition as contrasted with merely identifying its correlates.

National Rates of Attrition

Many researchers have studied the persistence withdrawal question on a national level and found that national college withdrawal rates held at approximately 50% through the first half of this century (Summerskill, 1962), and (Astin, 1975) and the trend has not markedly changed in recent years. These views are supported by the findings in the National Longitudinal Study (1973). National withdrawal rates for the two year period are as follows:

In four year colleges 5.28% of the students withdrew for academic reasons and 18.26% for nonacademic reasons, yielding a 23.54% withdrawal rate for the two year period. Two year colleges were found to have a 39.3% withdrawal rate, 6% for academic reasons and 33.3% for nonacademic reasons. In general, attrition rates for freshmen were found to be almost twice the sophomore attrition rates resulting mostly for academic reasons.

Iffert (1957) reported on national attrition rates and concluded that: (a) fifty percent of the entering class will be "lost" to the average college by the end of four years, (b) only forty percent of the entering class will graduate from that college four years later, (c) the remaining ten percent will graduate from that college after four years, and (d) twenty percent of the "lost" students will graduate from some other institution eventually. These findings were confirmed by Summerskill (1962), who reviewed 35

attrition studies over a forty year period, 1913-1953.

Demographic Factors Associated with Attrition

Persistence and nonpersistence rates are university specific and may be more affected by institutional characteristics than by a single demographic variable. The purpose of the literature in this section is to point out the effects that selected demographic variables had on persistence and nonpersistence in a single institution and universities in general throughout the nation.

Student persistence can be affected by a variety of variables many of which are the indecisive or background factors of the student. Research findings on attrition and such demographic factors as; age, sex, socioeconomic status, family income, parents education, ethnicity, hometown, location and size, and high school size is summarized in this section.

Age - Considerable research has been done on the influence of a students age as a factor in attrition, Bragg (1966) and Suddarth (1957) concluded that the attrition rates were similar for students who were either younger or older than the average age of the entering college student. Sexton (1965), Summerskill and Darley (1955) found that older freshmen are less likely to graduate than freshmen of the usual age. Further, they said the data should be interpreted with care in that the same factors that delayed the student's entrance into college might very well continue and cause the student to drop out. Eckland (1964) found that students who complete their military service before entering college have better persistence rates than entering students of normal age. Sexton (1965) concluded that "generally speaking" students who enrolled at the normal age plus

or minus a year had a better chance of persisting than students who were two or more years off the median age of entering students. She also concluded that age was very likely not a crucial factor in determining the probabilities of attrition.

The evidence suggests that age is not a primary factor in causing attrition.

Sex - Iffert (1957) considered sex as a factor in attrition and concluded that no significant difference existed in the overall attrition rates of women and men. The study has been replicated by Summerskill and Darley (1955), Suddarth (1957), and Sewell and Shah (1967). There are discrepancies in the conclusions drawn by researchers on sex as a factor in attrition. Darley (1962) found that the sex variable is an important factor in attrition at some institutions and not at others. Astin (1972) showed that more men eventually graduate beyond a four year sequence. Astin (1964) also determined that once a woman dropped out, she is less likely to enroll again. The net effect seems to be that more women graduate in four years, but that more men will persist in college over the next several years, so that the ten year graduation rates ultimately favor the men.

The evidence is strong that sex is not a significant variable in determining persistence or attrition, but becomes more significant as scholastic, environmental, and longitudinal factors are taken into consideration.

Socioeconomic Status - Summerskill (1962) stated that although socio-economic factors are commonly believed to influence attrition, research has provided equivocal results. There has been little agreement as

to the effects and significance of SES factors on rates of attrition. Eckland (1965) argued that the sources of the ambiguity were methodological flaws that overlooked two factors: (1) the student population in institutions are similar in composition and relatively uniform with respect to SES. Since most research is based on data from a single institution, it is not surprising that no significant correlations are found between SES variables and persistence or attrition (2) most studies cover a period of only four years or less which is an unrealistic treatment of the length of time from enrollment in college to eventual graduation.

Family Income - Rossman and Kirk (1970) concluded that students whose fathers were in lower occupational positions do not drop out at significantly higher rates.

Eckland's (1965) analysis of factors related to college attrition suggested very strongly that family income is not a direct factor in attrition.

Parental Education - Rossman and Kirk (1970) found no evidence to support the hypothesis that higher levels of parental education increase the student's chances of persisting through college. Parental education does not appear to be one of the major factors in determining persistence or attrition.

Ethnicity - Ethnicity as an attrition variable was studied by Astin (1973). He found that Jewish students are more likely to graduate in four years than non-Jewish students. Conversely, that Chicano students have a substantially lower probability of graduating. Astin found no significant differences for students who are Black, Oriental, or American Indian when academic factors in the student's background

are held constant (e.g., high school rank and scholastic aptitude test scores).

Fidler and Ponder (1973-1976) used race as a controlling variable in a comparative analysis of students at the University of South Carolina and concluded that black students had consistently higher survival rates than did whites.

Hometown Location and Size - Summerskill (1962) researched the influence that hometown location and size had on attrition and concluded that students from small towns have higher attrition rates. Iffert (1955) concluded that location of a student's home in relation to college had no significant bearing on his chances of graduation.

High School Size - Current research findings tend to support the view that there is no relation between attrition and high school size, although there is some evidence that graduates of very small high schools are more likely to drop out of college, Astin (1968) and Slocum, (1956).

Academic Factors Associated with Attrition

Summarized in this section is literature on the effects that academic performance has on college student persistence and non-persistence. There are some differences of opinion among researchers as to the importance of the academic variable(s) in attrition.

Studies reviewed here focus on scholastic aptitude and first semester college grades.

Scholoastic Aptitude - Academic factors as attrition variables have been researched extensively by Panos and Astin (1968), Slocum (1956), Iffert (1955), and others. A majority of these studies have found that GPA and class rank in high school differentiate potential dropouts from persisters. Eckland (1964) concluded that high school rank is only half as effective in predicting the permanency of dropout as it is in predicting which students are most likely to dropout.

A majority of the studies on scholastic aptitude concur that aptitude and ability as measured by SAT and ACE tests are significant in determining the difference between dropouts and non-dropouts. Williams (1966) cautioned that since dropouts are likely to re-enroll elsewhere, it may be that there is no discernible difference between the two groups because both of the groups are composed, in part, of "persisting" students.

First Semester College Grades - Summerskill (1962) found a significant relationship between attrition and first semester college grades in the 35 studies he examined. His view is supported by Suddarth (1957), Slocum (1956) and Morrisey (1971). Summerskill cautioned that poor grades are a far more stable predictor of attrition than good grades are a predictor of retention, since successful students drop out in larger numbers than would be expected. The data suggest that poor grades in general do not cause attrition, but must be coupled with other non-intellectual factors.

Motivational, Vocational, and Personality Factors Associated with Attrition

Motivation

Marks (1967) examined motivation in terms of the students' expectations about their chances of dropping out. His findings indicate that the expectations were related to the student's level of aspiration, fear of failure, and parental attitudes. Further, he found that: (a) those students who expect to drop out do so in significantly large percentages, (b) there is no correlation between the expectation of dropping out and the student's scholastic ability, (c) those students most likely to drop out were uncommitted to college and had low aspirations and educational values, and (d) those students who dropped out had difficulty resolving conflicts concerning their commitment to educational values.

Vocational and Occupational Goals - The findings on vocational goals and occupational interests are inconsistent. Barger and Hall (1965) and Panos and Astin (1968) found no significant relation between vocational goals and attrition. Frank and Kirk (1975) and Sexton (1965) reported that the development of a vocational objective increases the student's GPA.

Personality Factors - Researchers indicate that there may be personality differences between student dropouts and persisters. Heilbrun (1965) concluded that the main personality difference between dropouts and persisters was found on the Socialization (So) and Responsibility (Re) scales of personality tests such as the MMPI. Scores on these sub-scales revealed that students who persist are higher in the socialization measures of personal maturity, freedom from rebellion and authority

problems, and the capacity to live with others without friction. The responsibility scores show higher levels of seriousness of thought, development of values and dependability. He also found that "successful" students are more conforming; also more self-sufficient.

Personality traits of dropouts have usually been negative. Astin (1965), Heilbrun (1965), and Johnson (1970) agree that the dropout is more unable to adapt to "the college milieu," is aloof, assertive, critical, disagreeable, immature, impulsive, rebellious against authority, self-centered, lacking in self-sufficiency, and uncertain about the future.

College Environment

Most of the research on persistence and nonpersistence prior to 1957 did not consider college environment. The general feeling was that environment did not affect retention or attrition and it, therefore, had no important role to play in the study of attrition. There has been a re-evaluation of this assumption. Current research has provided considerable evidence that the college environment plays a major role in student persistence and withdrawal. Research related to attrition, college size, and housing is summarized below.

College Size - Feldman and Newcomb (1969) examined college size and its effect on attrition, and reported that large institutions: (a) reduce the students' confidence in themselves in terms of their social acceptability and scholastic ability, (b) are less likely to be regarded by the students as friendly and cohesive communities, and (c) promote less contact between faculty and students. These factors, they said,

contribute to increasing the students' dissatisfaction with the institution, thus making dropping out more probable. Panos and Astin (1968) reported that the physical size of a large institution is a factor in influencing attrition--the more time it takes to get from one place to another on campus, the greater the rate of attrition.

Housing - Campus housing has been thoroughly studied and the research has shown conclusively that students living off campus are much more likely to drop out than those who live on campus, Astin (1973), Iffert (1957), Newcomb (1962), and Slocum (1956).

Reasons for Withdrawal

The research on why students withdraw from college has focused on financial factors, health factors, and withdrawal in general and is summarized below.

Financial Factors - Iffert found that financial difficulties were ranked third in importance by students as a reason for dropping out. Summerskill (1962) reviewed twenty-one studies and found in sixteen that financial reasons were ranked among the top three most important in attrition. Economic reasons are among the most obvious causes of attrition--students drop out if they cannot afford to continue.

Health Factors - Health of the student and/or his family is not considered a major cause of attrition, but it is considered as significant. Iffert (1957) found that health factors had some significance for 7% of the men and 10% of the women who dropped out.

Withdrawal from College - Kauffman (1964) and Cope (1968) classified student reports of reasons for withdrawal. The most frequently cited reason that students gave concerned academic matters, which emcompassed

poor grades, dissatisfaction with the curriculum and other academic problems. Dropping out because of financial reasons was cited almost as often. Motivational problems included uncertainity about educational and occupational goals, lack of interest in studies and inability to study. Frequently cited were personal considerations such as emotional problems and problems of adjustment to college life. Less frequently cited problems were dissatisfaction with the size of college, its social and academic environment.

Summary

Research findings from studies on student persistence and withdrawal have brought about the development of a wide range of views on what effect variable(s) have on students and their persistence or withdrawal from college.

The most meaningful research findings on attrition have been provided by studies that have precise operational definitions and cover periods of more than four years. Research on various factors that cause attrition has been extensive and the findings support the view that dropping out of college is the result of the interplay of many complex variables.

Most of the studies summarized in this investigation grouped attrition variables under three headings: (1) demographic, (2) socioeconomic, and (3) academic. The findings support the view that academic factors are by far the most important predictors of attrition and the evidence suggests that these factors account for half of the variance in college persistence and withdrawal.

While most socioeconomic variables are not important predictors of college withdrawals when high school G.P.A. is controlled, it

was found that parental education may be a major factor. The role of financial factors in attrition has not been clearly delineated; however, the research suggests that financial reasons for withdrawal tend to be temporary and that students eventually re-enroll.

The findings on demography indicate that age and sex are not important variables in overall attrition rates for the nation but may be important for an individual college.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted using a snapshot approach focusing on student persistence of a one-year period from Fall 1976 to Fall 1977. Information was collected from the Student Master Registration File for all students enrolled in the Fall of 1976 and was then matched against the Fall 1977 file for the purpose of identifying those students who could be classified as either persisters or non-persisters for the one-year period. The most difficult part of any attrition or retention study is establishment of clear definitions for persisting and non-persisting students. For the purpose of this study the following definitions were employed:

> Student Persister -- An undergraduate student enrolled at ODU during the Fall of 1976 and Fall 1977. Students with planned graduation dates falling within the one-year period were treated as persisters.
>
> Student Non-Persister -- An undergraduate student enrolled in ODU in the Fall of 1976, but did not re-enroll in 1977 and did not have a plan to graduate date falling within the one-year period.
>
> Degree-Seeking Student -- A degree seeking student is one who has submitted an official application for consideration by any division or school of the university.
>
> Non-Degree Seeking Student -- One who has completed secondary education and is not currently pursuing a degree but is interested in receiving credit for course work taken on campus, off-campus, or in the summer sessions.

After identifying the sample from the Master Registration File, historical information on some 20 persistence variables was collected. The 20 variables were sub-divided into 3 major categories: demographic academic, and other college related. Data collection was completed and each individual variable was analyzed to determine if it could

be used to identify the degree and non-degree persisting and non-persisting student at Old Dominion University.

Sample

The sample for this study consists of a total of 11,627 students of which 7,504 (65%) were identified as persisters and 4,123 (35%) were classified as non-persisters.

Participants were selected from the registration records in the Registrar's Office. The age of the students ranged between 18 and 76, with a median of 20 years of age for degree seeking students and 26.5 for non-degree seeking students. Of the total sample, 55.7% were male and 44.3% female.

The sample consisted of six ethnic groups: American Indian, Black, Asian, Hispanic, White-non-Hispanic, and a catch all category of "Other" were those participants who could not be racially identified from the existing records. Sixty-nine percent of the students in the sample were full-time and 31% were part-time.

Analysis

To determine if the 20 variables could be used to characterize the persisting and non-persisting students, a distribution analysis was employed. For example, lets consider the distribution of non-degree seeking persisting and non-persisting students by sex. These distributions are presented below.

Non-Degree (N=3126)					
Category	Persister N=917	%	Non-Persister N=2207	%	% Difference
Female	387	42.2%	709	32.1%	+10.1%
Male	530	57.8%	1498	67.9%	-10.1%
Missing Values	1		1		
Total	918	100.0%	2208	100.0%	0.0%

Looking at the table above, it will be noted that 42.2% of the persisters are female and 57.8% of the persisters are male. The non-persisters are distributed differently with 32.1% females and 67.9% males. From inspection of the percent difference column, we notice that there is a 10% difference between the persister and non-persister distribution percentages for both the male and female categories.

For the purpose of this study, a meaningful difference in the distributions was assumed to exist if the difference between the percent of persisters and non-persisters in one category was 5% or greater. From examination of the above table, it is clear that for non-degree seeking students, sex is a meaningful variable for distinguishing between the two categories since the percent difference between the persisting and non-persisting in both the male and female category is greater than 5%. From this analysis we would expect the probability to be greater for a male non-degree student becoming a non-persister than for a female non-degree student.

Each of the 20 variables were analyzed using the above technique to determine if they could be used to characterize the persisting and non-persisting ODU student.

RESULTS

Twenty (20) student variables from the Student Master File were investigated using the distribution analysis described in the previous section to determine if any of the variables could be used to characterize the persisting and non-persisting ODU student. The 20 variables were conveniently clustered into four major categories: (1) demographic, (2) academic pre-college, (3) academic ODU, and (4) other college related. A summary of the variables by category is presented in Table A. Results of the distribution analysis for each variable are also summarized in Table A where an "X" indicates that the variable could be used to characterize the persisting and non-persisting student. Detailed analysis of each variable can be found in Tables 1 thru 20 in Appendix A.

From inspection of Table A, it will be noted that of the 20 variables, 8 were useful for characterizing degree persisting and non-persisting students and 9 were useful in characterizing the non-degree persisting and non-persisting students. Of the four categories, the academic ODU variables appeared to be the only variables which could clearly be used to characterize both degree and non-degree persisting and non-persisting students. As might be expected, the degree seeking students were best characterized by academic and other college related variables.

The non-degree students were perhaps best characterized by certain demographic and other college related variables, even though caution must be used in interpreting the demographic variables because of incomplete data.

TABLE A

RESULTS OF DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS OF

TWENTY STUDENT VARIABLES BY CATEGORY

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	DEGREE PERSISTER and NON-PERSISTER	NON-DEGREE PERSISTER and NON-PERSISTER
DEMOGRAPHIC:	Age		
	Sex		X
	Race		X
	Marital Status		
	Legal Residency		X
	Current Military Status		X
ACADEMIC:PRE-COLLEGE:	S.A.T. Verbal		
	S.A.T. Math	X	
	S.A.T. Combined		
	High School Class Size		
	High School Percentile	X	
	High School Q.P.A.	X	
ACADEMIC-ODU:	Degree Sought	X	X
	Q.P.A.	X	X
	School in which Student Majors	X	
OTHER COLLEGE RELATED:	Financial Aid		
	Application Status	X	X
	Housing Perference	X	
	Day or Evening		X
	Part-time Full-time		X

The Old Dominion University degree seeking and non-degree seeking student persisters and non-persisters are characterized below.

Old Dominion University Degree Seeking Persisting and Non-persisting Students

The Old Dominion University degree seeking student who was identified as a persister did not significantly differ from the non-persister with regard to demographic variables such as age, sex, race, and marital status. With regard to pre-college academic variables, however, larger percentages of persisting students obtained higher Math S.A.T. scores, graduated in the upper percentiles of their high school class, and had higher high school quality point averages (QPA).

Perhaps the most meaningful variables for describing the persisting students were the ODU academic variables. Larger percentages of the persisters were seeking a bachelor's degree, had high ODU QPAs and were enrolled as students in the School of Sciences and Health Professions. The School of Sciences and Health Professions also has the largest student major enrollment in the University. The largest proportion of the degree seeking non-persisters were in the School of General Studies.

In terms of other college related variables, large proportions of the persisting students were admitted to the University on a full-time basis and attended classes primarily during the day (7 a.m. - 5 p.m.); whereas, the degree seeking non-persisters were enrolled on a part-time basis and attended classes primarily in the evening (after 5 p.m.).

Student residence at the University was an important variable in the persistence, non-persistence pattern. A larger proportion of the degree seeking persisters than degree seeking non-persisters were placed in campus housing; whereas, a large proportion of the non-persisting students desired to be placed on campus but were not.

In contrast to the degree seeking persister, large proportions of the degree seeking non-persisters had lower scores on the pre-college academic variables (S.A.T. Math, high school class rank, and high school QPA). With regard to college grades, larger proportions of the degree seeking non-persisting students had below average ODU QPA's. In terms of other college related variables, the non-persisting degree seeker is best characterized as a transfer, or readmitted student.

In summary, the degree seeking persisters tended to: (1) have a higher Math S.A.T, (2) graduate in upper percentiles of their high school class, (3) have a higher high school QPA, (4) have a higher ODU QPA, (5) be enrolled full-time day students, and (6) be living in campus housing or have requested such housing.

The degree seeking non-persisters, on the other hand, tended to (1) have lower Math S.A.T. scores, lower high school class rank, and lower high school QPA, (2) be enrolled in the School of General Studies indicating indecision about a college major, (3) not living in campus housing but having requested such housing, (4) have below average ODU QPAs, and (5) be a transfer student or have readmitted applicant status.

Old Dominion University Non-degree Seeking Persisting and Non-persisting Students

The Old Dominion University non-degree students identified as persisters differed demographically from those identified as non-degree non-persisters by sex, legal residency, and current military status. The non-degree non-persister was best characterized demographically as a male on active military status, with a legal residence out of the state of Virginia.

The pre-college academic variables for the non-degree persister and non-degree non-persister were not used in the analysis of results because: (1) the data were incomplete; therefore, (2) no judgment could be passed even though a meaningful difference between the non-degree persister and non-persister is shown in Tables 7-12 (Appendix A). The results cannot be interpreted with meaning since large amounts of data are missing.

Larger proportions of the non-degree persisters like the degree seeking persister had higher ODU QPAs than the non-persisting student.

The non-degree non-persisting student was likely to be enrolled in the School of General Studies as would be expected.

In terms of other college related variables, larger proportions of the non-degree persisters attended the University on a full-time basis (7 a.m. to 5 p.m.); whereas, the non-persisters attended on a part-time basis, usually in the evening (after 5 p.m.). Large proportions of the non-degree seeking non-persisting students attended the University on a non-matriculated basis, and were usually classified above the freshman level.

Unlike the degree seeking non-persister, the non-degree persister and the non-degree non-persister did not desire to live on campus.

In summary, the non-degree persister differed from the non-degree non-persister on demographic and other college related variables such as: (1) sex, (2) non-active military status, (3) in-state residency, and (4) higher ODU QPAs.

The non-degree non-persisters were characterized as: (1) male, (2) on active military status, (3) out-of-state residency, (4) non-matriculant, (5) above freshman level and enrolled in the School of General Studies.

APPENDIX A

Table 1

COMPARISONS OF THE DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE

PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY AGE

AGE Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 6555	%	Non-Persister N= 1906	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 910	%	Non-Persister N= 2203	%	% Diff.
15-17	72	1.1	17	.9	-.2	4	.4	7	.3	-.1
18-22	5094	77.7	1418	74.4	-3.3	374	41.1	826	37.5	-3.6
23-30	990	15.1	347	18.2	+3.1	326	35.8	861	39.1	+3.3
31-40	288	4.4	90	4.7	+.3	132	14.5	346	15.7	+1.2
41-76	111	1.7	34	1.8	+.1	75	8.2	163	7.4	-.8
Missing Values	31		9			8		5		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

Table 2

COMPARISONS OF THE DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE

PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY SEX

SEX Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 6586	%	Non-Persister N= 1915	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 917	%	Non-Persister N= 2207	%	% Diff.
Female	3135	47.6	917	47.9	-.3	387	42.2	709	32.1	+10.1
Male	3451	52.4	998	52.1	+.3	530	57.8	1498	67.9	-10.1
Missing Values	0		0			1		1		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 3

COMPARISONS OF THE DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE

PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY RACE

	Degree (N=8501)					Non-Degree (N=3126)				
RACE	Persister		Non-Persister			Persister		Non-Persister		
Category	N= 6498	%	N= 1891	%	% Diff.	N= 911	%	N= 2183	%	% Diff.
Am. Indian	13	.2	4	.2	.0	4	.5	13	.6	+.1
Black	279	4.3	93	4.9	+.6	71	7.8	240	11.0	+3.2
Asian	58	.9	9	.5	-.4	13	1.4	24	1.1	-.3
Hispanic	33	.5	13	.7	+.2	4	.5	42	1.9	+1.4
White-NonHisp.	5985	92.1	1730	91.5	-.6	792	86.8	1779	81.5	-5.3*
Other	130	2.0	42	2.2	+.2	27	3.0	85	3.9	+.9
Missing Values	88		24			7		25		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 4

COMPARISONS OF THE DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE

PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY MARITAL STATUS

MARITAL STATUS Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 6299	%	Non-Persister N= 1740	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 586	%	Non-Persister N= 1902	%	% Diff.
Divorced	63	1.0	42	2.4	+1.4	28	4.8	93	4.9	+.1
Married	1172	18.6	365	21.0	+2.4	240	41.0	782	41.1	+.1
Separated	63	1.0	26	1.5	+ .5	11	1.9	34	1.8	-.1
Single	4988	79.2	1307	75.0	-4.2	302	51.4	976	51.3	-.1
Widowed	13	.2	2	.1	- .1	5	.9	17	.9	- 0
Missing Values	287		175			332		306		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

Table 5

COMPARISON OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE

LEGAL RESIDENCY Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 6563	%	Non-Persister N= 1890	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 910	%	Non-Persister N= 2055	%	% Diff.
Virginia	5959	90.8	1635	86.5	-4.3	778	85.5	1000	48.7	-36.8*
Other	604	9.2	255	13.5	+4.3	132	14.5	1050	51.3	+36.8*
Missing Values	23		25			8		153		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 6

COMPARISON OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING

ODU STUDENT BY CURRENT MILITARY STATUS

CURRENT MILITARY STATUS Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 6580	%	Non-Persister N= 1912	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 917	%	Non-Persister N= 2205	%	% Diff.
Active Duty	53	.8	41	2.1	+1.3	122	13.3	1066	48.4	+35.1*
Non-Military	5790	88.0	1678	87.8	-.2	574	62.6	876	39.7	-22.9*
Veteran	737	11.2	193	10.1	-1.1	221	24.1	263	11.9	-12.2*
Missing Values	6	0	3			1		3		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 7

COMPARISONS OF S.A.T. VERBAL SCORE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR

PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS

S.A.T. VERBAL[1] Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 3518	%	Non-Persister N= 985	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N=39	%	Non-Persister N= 27	%	% Diff.
710-800	10	.3	1	.1	-.2	0	0	0	0	0
610-709	137	3.9	45	4.6	+.7	0	0	0	0	0
510-609	690	19.6	172	17.4	-2.2	1	2.6	2	7.4	+4.8
500-509[2]	151	4.3	45	4.6	+.3	0	0	0	0	0
400-499	1628	46.3	442	44.8	-1.5	10	25.6	9	33.3	+7.7
300-399	851	24.2	270	27.4	+3.2	27	69.2	12	44.4	-24.7*[3]
200-299	49	1.4	10	1.1	-.3	1	2.6	4	14.8	+12.2*[3]
Missing Values	3068		930			879		2181		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

[1] In storing scores on the computer, ODU rounds off the unit level digit, thus creating a 2 digit code (i.e., 509 becomes 50). This explains the "awkward" appearance of the mean and the 3 standard deviations above the mean.

[2] Verbal S.A.T. Scale Scores can range from 200-800 with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100.

[3] This result is a function of the large amount of missing data for non-degree students.

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 8

COMPARISON OF S.A.T. MATH SCORE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERISITING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS

S.A.T. MATH[1] Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 3518	%	Non-Persister N= 985	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=126) Persister N= 39	%	Non-Persister N= 27	%	% Diff.
710-800	18	.5	2	.2	-.3	0	0	0	0	0
610-709	464	13.2	64	6.5	-6.7*	0	0	0	0	0
510-609	1492	42.5	284	28.7	-13.8*	5	12.8	4	14.8	+2.0
500-509[2]	159	4.5	28	2.8	-1.7	0	0	0	0	0
400-499	1088	30.9	446	45.2	+15.6*	17	43.6	8	29.7	-13.9*[3]
300-399	264	7.5	154	15.6	+8.1*	16	41.0	13	48.1	+7.1*[3]
200-299	33	.9	7	.7	-.2	1	2.6	2	7.4	+4.8
Missing Values	3068		930			879		2181		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

[1] In storing scores on the computer, ODU rounds off the unit level digit, thus creating a 2-digit code (i.e., 509 becomes 50). This explains the "awkward" appearance of the mean and the 3 standard deviations above the mean.

[2] Math S.A.T. Scale Scores can range from 200-800 with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100.

[3] This result is a function of the large amount of missing data for non-degree students.

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 9

COMPARISON OF THE COMBINED S.A.T. SCORE DISTRIBUTION FOR

DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS

S.A.T. COMBINED[1]	Degree (N=8501)					Non-Degree (N=3126)				
	Persister		Non-Persister			Persister		Non-Persister		
Category	N= 3518	%	N= 985	%	% Diff.	N= 39	%	N=27	%	% Diff.
710-800	3	.1	0	0	-.1	0	0	0	0	0
610-709	134	3.8	35	3.6	-.2	0	0	0	0	0
510-609	901	25.6	221	22.4	-3.2	1	2.6	2	7.4	+4.8
500-509	88	2.5	23	2.3	-.2	0	0	0	0	0
400-499	1857	52.8	532	54.0	+1.2	15	38.5	11	40.7	+2.2
300-399	521	14.8	169	17.2	+2.4	22	56.3	10	37.0	-19.3*[3]
200-299	14	.4	5	.5	+.1	1	2.6	4	14.9	+12.3*[3]
Missing Values	3068		930			879		2181		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

[1]See notes on S.A.T. Verbal Score

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 10

COMPARISON OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY HIGH SCHOOL CLASS SIZE

HIGH SCHOOL CLASS SIZE Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 3469	%	Non-Persister N= 934	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 175	%	Non-Persister N= 41	%	% Diff.
> 800	49	1.4	24	2.6	+1.2	3	1.7	3	7.3	+5.6*
701-800	167	4.8	49	5.2	+.4	1	.6	1	2.4	+1.8
601-700	374	10.8	79	8.5	-2.3	12	6.9	3	7.3	+.4
501-600	666	19.2	168	18.0	-1.2	25	14.3	8	19.5	+5.2*
401-500	728	21.0	208	22.3	+1.3	27	15.4	13	31.7	+16.3*[1]
301-400	531	15.3	142	15.2	-.1	38	21.7	3	7.3	-14.4*[1]
201-300	416	12.0	108	11.5	-.5	31	17.7	1	2.4	-15.3*[1]
101-200	323	9.3	86	9.2	-.1	24	13.7	4	9.8	-3.9
< 100	215	6.2	70	7.5	+1.3	14	8.0	5	12.3	+4.3
Missing Values	3117		981			743		2167		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

[1]Caution should be used in interpreting this difference due to the very small numbers used to calculate the percentages.

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 11

COMPARISON OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING

ODU STUDENTS BY HIGH SCHOOL PERCENTILE RANK

HIGH SCHOOL PERCENTILE	Degree (N=8501)					Non-Degree (N=3126)				
	Persister		Non-Persister			Persister		Non-Persister		
Category	N= 3294	%	N=841	%	% Diff.	N= 24	%	N= 14	%	% Diff.
75-99	1634	49.6	322	38.3	-11.3*[1]	3	12.5	2	14.2	+1.7
50-74	1024	31.1	309	36.7	+5.6*[1]	9	37.5	6	42.9	+5.4*[1]
25-49	511	15.5	174	20.7	+5.2*[1]	7	29.2	6	42.9	+13.7*[1]
1-24	125	3.8	36	4.3	+.5	5	20.8	0	0	-20.8*[1]
Missing Values	3292		1074			894		2194		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

[1] Caution should be used in interpreting this difference due to the very small numbers used to calculate the percentages.

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 12

COMPARISON OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING

ODU STUDENTS BY HIGH SCHOOL Q.P.A.

HIGH SCHOOL Q.P.A. Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 1102	%	Non-Persister N= 320	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 75	%	Non-Persister N= 10	%	% Diff.
3.6-4.0	87	7.9	16	5.0	-2.9	3	4.0	1	10.0	+6.0*[1]
3.1-3.5	199	18.1	39	12.2	-5.9*[1]	12	16.0	1	10.0	-6.0*[1]
2.6-3.0	318	28.8	92	28.7	-.1	13	17.3			-17.3*[1]
2.1-2.5	330	29.9	113	35.3	+5.1*[1]	17	22.7	2	20.0	-2.7
1.6-2.0	149	13.5	54	16.9	+3.4	21	28.0	5	50.0	+22.0*[1]
1.1-1.5	15	1.4	6	1.8	+.4	9	12.0			-12.0*[1]
.6-1.0	4	.4	0	0		0	0	1	10.0	+10.0*[1]
Missing Values	5484		1595			843		2198		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918		2208	100.0	0.0

42

[1] Caution should be used in interpreting this difference due to the very small numbers used to calculate the percentages.

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 13

COMPARISON OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY TYPE OF DEGREE BEING SOUGHT

DEGREE TYPE	Degree (N=8501)					Non-Degree (N=3126)				
	Persister		Non-Persister			Persister		Non-Persister		
Category	N= 6508	%	N= 1900	%	% Diff.	N= 916	%	N= 2208	%	% Diff.
Undecided	1269	19.5	925	48.8	+29.3*	660	72.1	2150	97.4	+25.3*
Ph.D.	6	.1	0	0	-.1	0	0	0	0	0
CAS	6	.1	0	0	-.1	0	0	0	0	0
MS	213	3.3	69	3.5	+.2	8	.9	0	0	-.9
BS	4973	76.4	891	46.9	-29.5*	248	27.0	38	1.7	25.3*
AA	39	.6	15	.8	+.2	0	0	20	.9	+.9
Missing Values	81		15			2		0		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 14

COMPARISON OF ODU Q.P.A. DISTRIBUTIONS FOR DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS

ODU Q.P.A. Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 6586	%	Non-Persister N= 1915	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 918	%	Non-Persister N= 2208	%	% Diff.
3.6-4.0	501	7.6	75	3.9	-3.7	89	9.7	225	10.3	+.6
3-1-3.59	1219	18.5	174	9.1	-9.4*	144	15.7	159	7.2	-8.5*
2.6-3.00	1884	28.7	305	15.9	-12.8*	210	22.9	406	18.4	-4.5
2.1-2.59	1943	29.6	370	19.3	-10.3*	229	24.8	201	9.1	-15.7*
1.6-2.09	797	12.1	350	18.3	+6.2*	145	15.8	338	15.3	-.5
1.0-1.59	151	2.3	237	12.4	+10.1*	41	4.5	106	4.8	+.3
.6-1.09	53	.8	121	6.3	+5.5*	22	2.4	100	4.5	+2.1
.01-.59	27	.4	283	14.8	+14.4*	38	4.2	673	30.4	+26.2*
Missing Values	0		0			0		0		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

44

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 15

COMPARISON OF SCHOOL ENROLLMENT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS

SCHOOLS AT ODU	Degree (N=8501)					Non-Degree[1] (N=3126)				
	Persister		Non-Persister			Persister		Non-Persister		
Category	N= 6572	%	N= 1900	%	% Diff.	N= 916	%	N= 2208	%	% Diff.
Gen. Studies	1216	18.5	893	47.0	+28.5*	660	71.9	2151	97.3	+25.4*[1]
Health Science	1341	20.4	230	12.1	-8.3*	49	5.3	26	1.2	-4.1
Engineering	603	9.2	133	6.9	-2.3	29	3.2	8	.4	-2.8
Education	1151	17.5	191	10.1	-7.4*	63	6.9	7	.3	-6.3*[1]
Business	1236	18.8	237	12.5	-6.3*	55	6.0	8	.4	-5.6*[1]
Arts & Letters	1025	15.6	216	11.4	-4.2	62	6.7	8	.4	-6.3*[1]
Missing Values	14		15			2		0		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

[1] Caution should be used in interpreting this difference due to the very small numbers used to calculate the percentages.

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 16

COMPARISONS OF THE DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE

PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY DESIRE FOR FINANCIAL AID

DESIRE FOR FINANCIAL AID	Degree (N=8501)					Non-Degree (N=3126)				
	Persister		Non-Persister			Persister		Non-Persister		
Category	N= 5828	%	N= 1703	%	% Diff.	N= 389	%	N= 135	%	% Diff.
Yes	2057	35.3	608	35.7	+.4	135	37.4	49	36.3	+1.6
No	3771	64.7	1095	64.3	-.4	254	65.3	86	63.7	-1.6
Missing Values	758		212			529		2073		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

Table 17

COMPARISONS OF THE DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE

PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS BY APPLICATION STATUS

APPLICATION Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 6051	%	Non-Persister N= 1835	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 881	%	Non-Persister N= 2166	%	% Diff.
Transfer	1730	28.6	506	27.6	-1.0	36	4.1	15	.7	-3.4
ReAdmitted	775	12.8	316	17.2	+4.4	24	2.7	9	.4	-2.3
Non-Matriculated	157	2.6	124	6.8	+4.2	527	59.8	2081	96.1	+36.3*
Matriculated	472	7.8	101	5.5	-2.3	271	30.8	51	2.4	-28.4*
Graduated	24	.4	6	.3	-.1	1	.1	2	.1	0
Freshmen	2893	47.8	782	42.6	-5.2*	22	2.5	9	.4	-2.1
Missing Values	535		80			37		41		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	00.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

* Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 18

COMPARISON OF HOUSING PREFERENCE FOR DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE

PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS

HOUSING PREFERENCE Category	Degree (N=8501) Persister N= 5845	%	Non-Persister N= 1705	%	% Diff.	Non-Degree (N=3126) Persister N= 391	%	Non-Persister N= 139	%	% Diff.
Home	3530	60.4	1052	61.7	+1.3	272	69.6	94	67.6	-2.0
Off-Campus	701	12.0	223	13.1	+1.1	87	22.3	28	20.1	-2.2
Desire On	970	16.6	387	22.7	+6.1*	24	6.1	13	9.4	+3.3
Placed On	643	11.0	43	2.5	-8.5*	8	2.0	4	2.9	+.9
Missing Values	741		210			527		2069		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 19

COMPARISON OF THE DAY AND EVENING DISTRIBUTIONS FOR

DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS

DAY AND EVENING CLASSES	Degree (N=8501)					Non-Degree (N=3126)				
	Persister		Non-Persister			Persister		Non-Persister		
Category	N= 6579	%	N= 1913	%	% Diff.	N= 916	%	N= 2206	%	% Diff.
Day	6072	92.3	1750	91.5	-.8	524	57.3	676	30.6	-26.7*
Evening	507	7.7	163	8.5	+.8	392	42.7	1530	69.4	+26.7*
Missing Values	7		2			2		2		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

Table 20

COMPARISON OF STUDENT STATUS DISTRIBUTIONS FOR DEGREE AND NON-DEGREE PERSISTING AND NON-PERSISTING ODU STUDENTS

STUDENT STATUS	Degree (N=8501)					Non-Degree (N=3126)				
	Persister		Non-Persister			Persister		Non-Persister		
Category	N= 6586	%	N=1914	%	% Diff.	N= 916	%	N= 2208	%	% Diff.
Full-time	5703	86.6	1601	83.6	-3.0	363	39.6	322	14.6	-25.0*
Part-time	883	13.4	314	16.4	+3.0	553	60.4	1886	85.4	+25.0*
Missing Values	0		1			2		0		
TOTALS	6586	100.0	1915	100.0	0.0	918	100.0	2208	100.0	0.0

*Scores that show important differences by the 5% decision rule.

References

Angers, W. P. Achievement motivation in college and prevention of dropouts. Catholic Education Review, 1961, 59, 34-39.

Astin, A. W. Personal and environmental factors associated with college dropouts among high aptitude students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 55, 219-227.

Astin, A. W. Effect of different college environments on the vocational choices of high aptitude students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 28-34.

Astin, A. W. College dropouts: A national profile. ACE Research Reports, 1972, 1, 1-71.

Astin, A. W. Impact of dorm living on students. Educational Record, 1973, 54, 204-210.

Astin, A. W. Student persistence: Some stay, some don't--why? College and University, 1973, 48, 298-306.

Barger, B., & Hall, E. Time of drop out as a variable in the study of college attrition. College and University, 1965, 41, 84-88.

Bertrand, J. R. Relation between high school average grade and academic achievement. College and University, 1955, 30, 166-181.

Bragg, E. W. A study of student withdrawal at "W. U." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 199-202.

Carew, D. K. A comparison of activities, social acceptance, and scholastic achievement of men students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1957, 36, 121-124.

Cope, R. G. Limitations of attrition rates and causes given for dropping out of college, Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9, 386-392.

Darley, J. G. Promise and performance. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1962.

Demitroff, J. S. Student persistence. College and University, 1974, 49, 553-567.

Demos, G. D. Analysis of college dropouts--some manifest and covert reasons. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 46, 681-684.

Eckland, B. K. College dropouts who came back. Harvard Educational Review, 1964, 34, 402-420.

Eckland, B. K. Social class and college graduation: Some misconceptions corrected. American Journal of Sociology, 1965, 70, 36-50.

Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Gekowski, N., & Schwartz, S. Student mortality and related factors. Journal of Educational Research, 1961, 54, 192-194.

Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. Personality factors in college dropouts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 1-7.

Iffert, R. E. The student retention and withdrawal study. College and University, 1955, 30, 406-411.

Iffert, R. E. Retention and withdrawal of college students (Bulletin 1958, #1). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

Johansson, C. B., & Rossmann, J. E. Persistence at a liberal arts college: A replicated, five-year longitudinal study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 1-9.

Johnson, D. E. Personality characteristics in relation to college persistence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 162-167.

Kauffman, J. F. Student personnel services: Some questions and recommendations. Educational Record, 1964, 45, 355-365.

Marks, E. Student perceptions of college persistence, and their intellective, personality and performance correlates. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1967, 58, 210-221.

Marsh, L. M. College dropouts--A review. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 475-481.

Max, P. How many graduates? College and University, 1969, 45, 63-76.

Morrisey, R. J. Attrition in probationary freshmen. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 11, 279-285.

Newcomb, T. M. Student peer-group influence. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American College, New York: Wiley, 1962.

Panos, R. J., & Astin, A. W. Attrition among college students. American Educational Research Journal, 1968, 5, 57-72.

Rossman, J. E., & Kirk, B. A. Factors related to persistence and withdrawal among university students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 56-62.

Sewell, W., & Shah, V. Socioeconomic status, intelligence, and the attainment of higher education. Sociology of Education, 1967, 40, 1-23.

Sexton, V. S. Factors contributing to attrition in college populations: Twenty-five years of research. Journal of General Psychology, 1965, 72, 301-326.

Slocum, W. L. Social factors involved in academic mortality. College and University, 1956, 32, 54-64.

Suddarth, B. M. Factors influencing the graduation of freshmen who enroll at Purdue University. Unpublished report, June 1957. Cited in N. Sanford (Ed.), The American College. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Summerskill, J. Dropouts from college. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American College. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Summerskill, J., & Darling, C. D. Sex differences in adjustment to college. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1955, 46, 355-361.

Tinto, V. Dropouts from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Review of Educational Research, 1975, 45, 89-125.

Williams, V. Difficulties in identifying relatively permanent characteristics related to persistence in college. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 108.